



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the best success among those unions waging several boycotts" (p. 127). By the rule of the American Federation of Labor limiting the number of boycotts available to each national union, The Coopers could publish on the unfair list only three firms at any one time; in August, 1906, however, to take a typical instance, there were published in the *Cooper's Journal* (p. 549) the names of 70 firms unfair to that union. It is obviously impossible to determine from the small fraction of a union's complete unfair list, which is published in the American Federation unfair list, whether that union was successful or unsuccessful in waging boycotts.

The book suffers, too, from the use of the questionnaire as a device for collecting data in a serious investigation of a labor problem. Twelve firms which had been on the unfair list of the American Federation of Labor for periods varying from four months to three and a half years wrote to the author that they were unaware of even the existence of the boycott (p. 120). Little reliance should be placed upon such replies, many of which are not to be taken literally but merely as expressions of the spirit of bravado of individual employers. In actual practice, indeed, the American Federation of Labor makes it a point to communicate not once, but several times, with those employers whom it contemplates placing upon its unfair list, a procedure which renders highly improbable the alleged ignorance of the twelve boycotted employers. Equally futile is it to ask a union officer whether or not his particular union employs the boycott and, if it does, with what success (p. 127). In an interview with the reviewer this summer, several officials of the New York local union of the carpenters stated that they knew nothing of the boycott in that city on unfair trim; the fact is, however, that strikes against the installation of unfair trim are matters of almost daily occurrence in Greater New York, and have been so from 1896 to the present.

LEO WOLMAN.

Johns Hopkins University.

Ueber Syndikalismus und Lohnminimum. Zwei Vorträge. By
LUJO BRENTANO. (Munich: Süddeutsche Monatshefte
G. m. b. H. 1913. Pp. 114. 1 M.)

Professor Brentano's lectures on phases of the labor problem are always significant. He combines with complete mastery of all of the details of the labor movement, a remarkable faculty for summing up compactly and yet vividly the essentials of his subject

and showing its relation to current tendencies at home and abroad.

The facts with reference to syndicalism and the policy of establishing minimum wages with the binding force of law are now so familiar to economists that it is unnecessary to repeat them. In Brentano's pages, however, they take on new meaning. Brief as his treatment necessarily is, he manages in these two lectures to reproduce the whole course of the labor struggle from the repression of labor organizations and the regulation of wages in the interest of employers in Europe, in the eighteenth century, to the deliberate fostering of organizations and regulation of wages in the interest of wage-earners themselves in Australasia, in the twentieth.

The growth of syndicalism he ascribes to the desperation to which the weaker and less well organized workers have been driven by the failure of wages to rise in recent years as rapidly as have prices. The movement is strongest in France, he thinks, because there labor organizations are weakest. Its brief vogue in England he ascribes chiefly to the personal influence of Tom Mann, since he agrees with Hobson and Macdonald that its philosophy is quite alien to British common sense and little calculated to appeal to wage-earners who see almost daily evidences of the advantages to be secured through governmental action. In Germany and Scandinavian countries the opposition of the state socialists will, he believes, prove an insuperable barrier to the spread of syndicalist ideas. At the same time, he sees in the movement a warning that even more aggressive efforts must be made to extend the field of collective bargaining and protect through labor laws the classes who for any reason cannot organize effectively to protect themselves. His second lecture he calls significantly "On the Way to the Legal Minimum Wage" (*Auf dem Wege zum gesetzlichen Lohn-minimum*).

Beginning with the wage-boards and arbitration courts of Australasia, he describes in this lecture the steps by which the legal-minimum-wage policy has been introduced into the United Kingdom, and concludes that the principle, accepted first as a means of remedying the sweating system and settling the coal strike, is bound to spread until it is an accredited part of the program of protective labor legislation of all progressive countries.

Even more interesting to American readers than these lectures is the appendix attached to them in which is narrated the history of the controversy in which Professor Brentano's advocacy of collective bargaining involved him with certain representatives of

German employers' associations. Statements which he had made in a previous lecture were not only misquoted and distorted but made the basis of a concerted effort to represent him as an embittered enemy of German employers and a deliberate fomentor of violence and thus to discredit him as an economist. After trying in vain to correct the misstatements made about his teachings by dignified replies, he finally felt compelled to bring actions for malicious slander against his detractors. The five suits which he instituted were all successful. The imposition of fines proving ineffective, since the employers' association which was involved bore all of the costs, he succeeded in forcing his most unscrupulous adversaries formally to withdraw their charges and pledge themselves to correct the falsehoods which they had circulated. The incident is illuminating in many ways. It reveals the sensitiveness of German employers and the strained relations which have resulted from the refusal of many of them to enter into systems of collective bargaining with their employees, even when they are themselves organized in strong associations. It shows what great weight attaches in Germany to the statements of a professor of economics and what influence a teacher like Brentano has come to exert over public opinion. Finally, it proves that, in Germany at least, a resort to the law may sometimes prove effective as a means of protecting a scientific reputation and securing authoritative disproof of slanderous statements.

In commenting on the continued innuendos of one of his critics after he had solemnly pledged himself to desist from spreading false information, Brentano declares feelingly that he will not allow himself to be further disturbed by anything this writer may say; that only one thing has any terror for him, that is, the necessity of again instituting legal proceedings to protect his reputation! To a high-minded, sensitive man like Professor Brentano the experience must have been intensely disagreeable. His German colleagues should be all the more grateful to him for standing up for what is quite as important as *Lehrfreiheit*, the right to have views on issues of the day that have been carefully formulated and deliberately expressed, correctly reported and honestly discussed by those who may happen not to agree with them.

HENRY R. SEAGER.

NEW BOOKS

BOOTH, C. *Industrial unrest and trade union policy*. (London: Macmillan. 1914. Pp. 32. 1s.)